THEOLOGY

VOL. LX OCTOBER, 1957 No. 448

Editorial

THE *Plan of Church Union in North India and Pakistan*[1] is definitive in the sense that the negotiating churches are now being asked to decide whether they want to enter into a union on the basis proposed. While the motives which for many years have prompted the movement towards union have been the same as were those in South India, and while the general structure of the united church will be similar, yet there are important differences in this case.

It is intended that a wider variety of denominations will participate in this union, namely the Baptists, the Brethren, the Disciples of Christ, the Anglicans, the Methodists (episcopal and non-episcopal), and the United Church of Northern India which is itself a union of Presbyterians and Congregationalists. It is particularly remarkable that the Baptists are involved, and the manner in which their attachment to "Believer's Baptism" is recognized and allowed for is not the least interesting part of the plan. It is plainly anticipated that the holding together of paedobaptists and anabaptists in one communion will be a delicate matter, at any rate to begin with, and sensible provisions are made to meet difficulties that may arise.

Another striking feature of this plan of union is that it provides for a general unification of the ministry at the outset, so avoiding the awkward and embarrassing expedient of an interim period. Evidently a vast amount of careful thought has been given to this aspect of the plan. The proposed arrangements for the actual unification are at first sight elaborate, but they have been conceived with a fine perception of the various convictions that had to be reconciled, and they may well set a pattern for future schemes of church union elsewhere.

A further point which we regard as well-conceived is the stated expectation that "in due time the Church will have a common Service Book, which will express the unity and breadth of its faith and life"—i.e. its own equivalent to the Book of Common Prayer. This expectation was not made explicit in the South India Scheme of Union, though in the event, as is well known, the C.S.I. has already taken notable steps in that direction.

The prospect that in North India and Pakistan, as well as in South India, there may before long be in operation such an ending and mending of schism as this plan envisages is one that will rejoice Christian hearts everywhere.

* * * * *

A brief but important contribution to New Testament theology, and to the Christian doctrine of the State in particular, will be found

[1] Third Revised Edition, 1957. Lutterworth Press, 2s. 6d.

in Professor Oscar Cullmann's *The State in the New Testament*.[1] Cullmann shows clearly that the N.T. as a whole teaches both that the State, even a heathen State, has a divinely ordered place within the economy of salvation, and that therefore the Christian is able to ascribe to it a higher dignity than the non-Christian citizen can do, and also that the Christian must always be critical towards it and on the watch to see that it does not fall away from the divine order. In the course of his argument Cullmann raises several interesting questions, e.g. our Lord's relation to the Zealots. He is perhaps inclined to press his theories a little too far. Thus, having maintained in Chapter I that, in addition to Simon Zelotes, who was certainly a Zealot, others of the Twelve *probably* were too, "like Judas Iscariot, Peter, and *possibly* the sons of Zebedee", he starts off Chapter II by assuming that this theory is firmly established: "We have seen that Jesus had Zealots around him in his closest company . . ." Cullmann is also inclined to read too much consistency into the N.T., e.g. between Romans 13 and Revelation 13. In an excursus he defends his view that in Rom. 13. 1 "powers" (ἐξουσίαι) refers to angelic powers as well as to the State. This view appears to have been rejected by many German critics without adequate consideration.

American Letter

THE PRACTICE OF INTINCTION IN THE AMERICAN CHURCH

THE General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church meeting in 1949 requested its Standing Liturgical Commission to prepare a report, in view of the discussion at Lambeth the previous year, surveying the whole practice of intinction in the Church and the several methods of its administration. In the same resolution, the Convention authorized bishops having jurisdiction to allow intinction as "an alternative method of administration" provided that the chalice in no case be withheld from any communicant who wished to receive "in the manner now provided by the Prayer Book". The Commission made a lengthy report to the succeeding General Convention of 1952, with a recommendation that a rubric be added to the rite of Holy Communion expressly giving to any communicant the right to receive "the Sacrament in both kinds simultaneously by intinction". But the Convention refused to accept this rubric, and left the whole matter very much as it had been in 1949. The report of the Commission is printed in the Journal of the 1952 Convention, and remains the most exhaustive survey on the subject hitherto produced in the American Church.

Actually, the subject of intinction first engaged the attention of General Convention as early as 1913—and before that date the matter had been discussed by the bishops at the Lambeth Conference

[1] S.C.M. Press, 12s. 6d.

of 1908. The practice began to appear in the American Church about the turn of the twentieth century, especially in places where there was an extensive ministry to persons with tuberculosis. It was the influenza epidemic that swept the country towards the close of the First World War, however, that brought into widespread use in parishes all over the land the custom of receiving communion by intinction. And the practice has been steadily on the increase ever since that time. The General Convention has often discussed the problem but has never taken definite measures either to suppress intinction or to regulate it. Meanwhile, individual bishops have severally taken the initiative in authorizing the practice or in denying permission for its use. But, by and large, the question is settled in most parishes according to the views and tastes of the priest in charge. Some dioceses have made an effort to regulate the precise method of intinction; but no uniform procedure has as yet commended itself to those who favour or foster the practice.

The Liturgical Commission's report of 1952 included a survey of the extent of the practice of intinction, based upon a questionary sent to all bishops having jurisdiction. The answers that came in only represent an approximate accuracy; but according to the statistics gathered at the time the following results were obtained: Of 79 dioceses reporting, 13 claimed that intinction was not in use at all; in 23 dioceses, it was a custom in not more than 3 parishes; 8 dioceses reported intinction in over 50 per cent of the parishes; ten, in over 25 per cent; the rest reported use in a few places—from 5 to 10 parishes.

Three methods of administration are in common use. In the majority of cases—and this includes most of the parishes where the priest favours intinction—the communicant is allowed to dip the consecrated Bread in the chalice himself. In many of these parishes a small cup (about the size of those used in private communions) is provided expressly for this purpose, to avoid the accident of the communicant moistening his fingers in the Wine. A second method, also in widespread use, is for the priest alone to dip the Bread in the Wine and place the intincted wafer in the mouth of the communicant. In some parishes, a variant of this practice is in use: the priest places the intincted wafer in the hand of the communicant. But this last method is becoming less common; and it was particularly condemned by the Liturgical Commission as more likely to cause accidental want of caution in administering the consecrated Elements.

Feelings about intinction, among both clergy and laity, are very strong in the Episcopal Church, both among protagonists of the practice and among its opponents. But the division of opinion is not in any way related to partisan "churchmanship". Both Catholic and Evangelical clergy and laity are divided on the issue. But it may be said that in general the Catholic clergy who favour intinction prefer to have the priest alone administer the intincted Bread by placing it to the lips of the communicants.

There is no doubt that hygienic reasons motivate most of those who favour intinction. Many lay people, for example, practise it

from time to time when they have infectious colds, but otherwise receive from the chalice in the traditional manner. The fear of tuberculosis is very strong among Americans, and in their public schooling they are conditioned very definitely to view any drinking from common cups as insanitary and unsafe. The argument of a few conservative churchmen that no danger of infection could possibly inhere in elements that have been sacramentally "consecrated" carries little weight. Similarly, much is made of the fact that the clergy are good insurance risks, although the clergy are the most exposed to possible infection because of the necessity of their consuming what remains of the consecrated Bread and Wine. This argument also does not impress very many.

In actual fact, the hygienic risks in receiving from the common chalice are largely admitted; but the reaction of clergy and laity to this risk varies according to temperament and taste. Indeed, it is becoming increasingly clear that many who practise intinction do so not because of any fear or scruple about being infected with disease, but because they object to a common cup for aesthetic reasons of taste. That is to say, if given a choice of method, their disposition and taste are weighted in favour of intinction. Contrarily, many of those who oppose intinction do so for their own reasons of taste. They commonly speak of it as "messy" or "unseemly". And there are, also, those who oppose it solely because it is not traditional, or because they do not believe that it is strictly legal by rubrical direction.

Of one thing, all parties are agreed. Intinction is in the Episcopal Church to stay. It seems most unlikely that any effort to suppress it can now be enforced without such efforts as would appear far out of proportion to its importance. The real problem before the American Church is whether or not it will settle upon one single method of administration. It is more than likely that future revision of the Prayer Book will make express provision for intinction. This, in any case, is done in the Liturgical Commission's proposed study on the Holy Communion rite.

Any impartial study of the history of the Church, both East and West, of the varied ways in which the faithful have received communion will show that there has never been a single preferred method. It cannot even be proved that the disciples at the Last Supper partook from one common Cup; it may well be that they poured from the Cup of Blessing into their own individual beakers. But considerations of historical relativity and change do not weigh very heavily with many people—especially when, in a matter such as intinction, their deepest feelings and emotions are aroused. The disturbance to devotion caused by varied customs of receiving communion at the same altar rail is very real to many people, whatever their opinions for or against intinction. This is the serious aspect of the whole matter, and one that calls for great Christian forbearance and charity on the part of both sides to the issue.

At the present time, the division of opinion in the Episcopal Church has an underlying, though not always expressed, doctrinal

implication. Those who favour intinction believe that the laity should be trusted to receive the Sacrament in whatever way they find conscientiously to be the most helpful to their own devotion. Many who oppose intinction do not think the laity should be given this responsibility for themselves. They believe that the Church should have an official authority in the matter, or at least that the priest (or bishop) should be able to enforce conformity, whether to one method or another. To this issue, which cuts very deep into fundamental convictions about the Church and the Ministry, no less than about the Sacraments, there seems at present to be no foreseeable solution. Like so many other things in our Anglican ethos, this question remains in tension.

A few of the more extreme Catholic clergy would solve the whole problem by resort to communion in one kind. But there is little likelihood that the Episcopal Church will go in this direction, even though there appears little interest in the theological implications of communion in one or in both kinds, respectively. There is certainly no debate about the fact that intinction involves a real communion in both kinds, for the consecrated Wine in the intincted wafer can be tasted. We are prepared, at least, to interpret the word "drink" in the broadest sense. The Holy Communion is a ceremonial meal. To partake of its sacred Elements ceremonially is sufficient. Thus if the Wine is tasted, though not drunk in the more common way of drinking, that is enough to satisfy. American churchmen approach these matters in quite a pragmatic way. In any case, they do not find that the question of intinction has anything to do with the theological significance of reception in both kinds.

There is one other problem that has loomed on the horizon in recent years: namely, the battle against alcoholism. No one in the Episcopal Church has the slightest interest in going the way of many Protestant denominations that have substituted unfermented grape juice for wine. But we are talking more seriously our pastoral responsibility to those of our people who are struggling valiantly with temptation. A few clergy recommend to alcoholics that they refuse (voluntarily) to receive from the chalice. Others believe that intinction is the best answer for these people, and assures them of a full participation in the Sacrament without danger to their physical and spiritual health. This would seem to be the way of Christian love, which after all is the ultimate value, whether theological or ethical, in the Church of Christ.

Massey H. Shepherd, Jr.

A Brontë Excursion

The catalogue of our public library lists sixteen books which deal biographically with the Brontë family or its various members. When I went to try to borrow one, they were all "out". So was every copy of each of the Brontë novels. This, the assistant informed me, was due to recent television programs, which seems an encouraging piece

of evidence that the television habit is not destroying the desire to read as rapidly as we are sometimes told. My own interest in the Brontës had been stimulated by a visit to Haworth on a cold, grey day in April. Haworth Parsonage is the kind of place which makes upon you a deeper impression than you realize at the time. In spite of the tea-shops and Brontë guides in the village, and in spite of the other trippers casually wandering over the house, it is possible to imagine the life of this astonishing family going on there, in the comfortless stone vicarage on the edge of the moors. It is, perhaps, easier to imagine it when you have gone home; forgotten about the museum, and remembered only the house, with its small rooms, looking out over the churchyard with that concentration of tombstones on legs which manages to place such bleakly intense emphasis upon mortality. The saga of the Brontë family certainly observes the unity of place. Haworth Parsonage belongs inescapably to each of them, and each of them belongs there and nowhere else.

In due course our public librarian was able to lend me *The Four Brontës*, by Lawrence and E. M. Hanson, for which I had originally asked. He lent me some other biographical works as well, but nothing nearly as good as this, which combines thorough scholarship with intelligent criticism and sympathetic understanding. It is strange, though, in so satisfying and careful a book, to find reference to the displeasure of the "Church Council" at Haworth over Mr Brontë's appointment in the year 1820, and to read later on that an assistant curate decided to "change his living". Trivial though these slips are, they make one wonder how close an acquaintance with life in a vicarage, or with church matters generally, is possessed by the authors, who are admirably equipped for their task in most other ways. It is around the matter of the religious outlook and practice of the Vicar of Haworth and his family that I have found my mind playing.

Few of the biographers show any sympathy with the Reverend P. Brontë. This is not surprising. He does not appear to have been a very sympathetic character, though he was certainly individual enough. There is the queer story of the test questions about life which he put to his children, each of them answering from behind a mask, which was supposed to overcome embarrassment and encourage frankness. (In modern children it would have been more likely to induce a fit of the giggles. But the Brontë children were not like that.) Their answers show that they had already been well indoctrinated with a "vale of tears" outlook upon this world, but they expressed themselves with a sturdy directness which should have pleased their father. There are also the unpleasantly self-satisfied letters which Mr Brontë wrote to his earlier "flame", when he wanted to marry again after Mrs Brontë's death. And there is his harsh treatment of his curate, Mr Nicholls, when that gentleman aspired to marry Charlotte. The Vicar of Haworth was not an attractive man; a bit of a social climber in his younger days, and an autocrat with a temper when he was old. Yet there are indications of another side to his character. The father of such a family is not likely to have

been without intelligence, nor without the capacity for powerful feeling. All the Brontës (except Branwell, his father's favourite) had a terrific sense of duty. This alone, though, is scarcely enough to account for the fact that the girls never seriously contemplated any course of action which would involve the slightest neglect of their father. Charlotte, strong and independent character though she was, did not, at the age of thirty-seven, appear to consider the possibility of marrying Mr Nicholls without her father's consent. It is true that the old man then depended so much upon his one surviving daughter that she could scarcely have gone off and left him alone. I think, nevertheless, that the children probably had more affection for their father than most of the biographers seem willing to allow.

But what was Mr Brontë like as a parish priest? I am sure that he would have preached with vigorous earnestness, but what did he preach about? Did he read, and, if so, what? What kind of devotional life did he have? I cannot find a convincing answer to any of these questions. What a pity that among all the mass of manuscript material which has come out of Haworth Parsonage, no one seems to have lighted upon any sermon notes left by the vicar. They would not have been without interest.

And what did Mr Brontë do with his time? Mr and Mrs Hanson give the impression that he told stories of ancient violence over the breakfast table, and then remained shut up in his study until it was time for bed. In one place they tell us that he preached on Sundays, and visited when he thought that a visit was necessary—presumably in cases of serious illness or trouble. Judging by the facility with which characters in all Brontë novels are liable to fall into a decline and die, there must have been fairly frequent funerals to conduct and sick-beds to visit. But Mr Brontë had a curate. There appears to have been a total absence of those parish functions and organizations which receive so much attention in a modern vicarage, though we should not forget the elaborate "school feast" splendidly described by Charlotte in *Shirley*. We hear nothing of any necessity to raise money for the parochial finances. Mr Brontë played little part in the social life of the neighbourhood, and parishioners do not seem to have appeared very often at the vicarage door; of course, they had no forms to be signed. There was no telephone. Diocesan officials and organizing secretaries (if there were such) had no typewriters or duplicating machines, which must have been a help. I doubt whether Mr Brontë was ever summoned to sit on a diocesan committee. He certainly did not do the washing-up, nor even attend to the fires, nor dig the garden. What makes a clergyman of those days seem even more remote to his modern successors is that he was apparently able to *expect* his parishioners—or an adequate number of them—to come to church without any particular effort on his part; much as a teacher nowadays expects his children to come to school. In *Shirley* it is assumed that the anti-clerical and radical Mr Yorke would, with his family, normally be present at church on Sundays; and this although he was at daggers drawn with the vicar. It is almost like having Mr Kingsley Martin as a parishioner and expecting him to be a sides-

man. The vicar was able to take his church and parish for granted in a way which would not be possible anywhere to-day. It looks a delightfully assured existence. But we are still left with Mr Brontë in his study. I wish that I knew what he did there. He can hardly have gone to sleep all the time.

Charlotte has left more evidence than any other Brontë of her views on matters ecclesiastical and theological. Much of it is in *Shirley*, which it is worth any parson's time to read. Charlotte plainly had such a down on curates that it is only poetic justice that she should have married one in the end. Incumbents are treated with altogether more respect. One wonders why. Perhaps clergymen as well as times have changed, but I should have thought that the fault of self-importance, which Charlotte disliked so much and so rightly, was more common among rural deans than among assistant clergy.

This is what the heroine of the novel (reputedly modelled on Emily Brontë) has to say about curates: "When I hear Messrs Malone and Donne chatter about the authority of the church, the dignity and claims of the priesthood, the deference due to them as clergymen; when I hear the outbreaks of their small spite against Dissenters; when I witness their silly narrow jealousies and assumptions; when their palaver about forms, and traditions, and superstitions, is sounding in my ear; when I behold their insolent carriage to the poor, their often base servility to the rich, I think the Establishment is indeed in a poor way, and both she and her sons appear in the utmost need of reformation."

Shirley was published in 1849, and this passage reads like a hostile account of young men taking up Tractarian ideas as a new fashion. Perhaps that is the explanation of the difference in the treatment of the curates and the more old-fashioned incumbents. Charlotte uses the word "Puseyite" as a term of abuse, standing for one who is a rigid stickler for minor points of ecclesiastical discipline, while remaining blind to the weightier matters of the Law. She has a real affection for and loyalty towards "the Establishment", but shows no glimmering of an understanding that the Church has any theological significance. Although she satirizes her curates for their superior attitude towards Dissenters, she herself portrays these enthusiastic interlopers into her father's preserves as canting humbugs. In one of those appallingly sententious passages which Charlotte seems to have thought that she owed her readers every now and then, she shows where her sympathies lay as a loyal daughter of the parsonage—albeit with "progressive" ideas: "Let England's priests have their due: they are a faulty set in some respects, being only of common flesh and blood like us all; but the land would be badly off without them; Britain would miss her church, if that church fell. God save it! God also reform it!"

It is always easier to call for Reform than for reforms, and we are given no indication of the kind of changes which Charlotte thought were needed. Is Dr Thomas Arnold, perhaps, somewhere in the background?

The Reverend Cyril Hall, Vicar of Nunnely, is apparently Charlotte's ideal of a clergyman. He is kind, scholarly and charitable, and young ladies are fond of him. He is not, however, a person of much significance or interest, and it is not suggested that either his attitude to his ministry or his pastoral methods were in any essential different from those of his colleagues. He is simply given a more attractive character.

Charlotte had a strong moral sense, which was not bound by convention, and a warm heart quick with human sympathy. She took the general framework of Christian belief for granted, without appearing very interested intellectually in any of it. Her religion was solid and sincere, but it did not much engage her imagination. The Church for her was a useful and time-hallowed institution; a necessary part of the nation. I cannot imagine Charlotte really understanding what Newman and Keble were concerned about, but I have found myself wishing that she had read F. D. Maurice. He would, I think, have aroused her sympathy, and he might have opened her eyes to much to which she was blind. Mr and Mrs Hanson mention that on her last visit to London she was taken to hear Maurice preach, but they say nothing about her impressions.

The magnificent Emily was never happy away from the Haworth setting which she loved so dearly and made so much a part of herself. Most of the people who met her found her rather frightening in life, and she is not easy to approach in her writing—intensely personal though this is. The last infirmity of noble minds held no attraction for Emily; though noble she certainly was. I know of no other writer who produced work of such distinction but was so completely indifferent to recognition. Perhaps indifferent is not the right word. It was not just that she did not care; she positively hated the thought of publicity. She was angry when Charlotte read her poems, and furious when Charlotte and Anne disclosed to their publisher the secret of her authorship of *Wuthering Heights*. Her writing was the only emotional outlet that she had. It may be true, as the Hansons suggest, that she despised herself for requiring it, though that does not seem to me an entirely adequate explanation. She certainly did not realize that she had written work which would take a permanent place in English literature. One gets the impression that the desire for recognition had been burnt out of her, as most other weaknesses had. The well-known story of how Emily, having been bitten in the arm by a savage dog, cauterized the wound herself with a red-hot poker and said nothing about it, is symbolic of much in her spiritual life.

If Charlotte could have learned from F. D. Maurice, I wish that Emily had encountered the works and life of St John of the Cross. What a superb Carmelite she might have made in different circumstances! St Theresa would, I think, have appreciated her. She might even have understood her.

Some of Emily's poems contain clear evidence of mystical experience. At that date, and in the circle in which she moved, she is not likely to have read the works of any of the great Christian mystics.

She found her way alone. Emily did most things alone. She is sometimes called a Nature-mystic, but this is only superficially true. There burns in some of her best work a thirst for union with Reality which goes beyond the Nature-mystic's contentment with present experience. The Being in which Emily longed to find her self through losing it was mediated by, but not identical with, Nature. (See especially lines 81–92 of the Poem "Julian M. and H. B. Rochelle", on page 239 of the Oxford Complete Poems.)

Emily was much possessed by death. It forms part of the subject-matter of a large proportion of her poems. And the Brontës knew what they were talking about when they spoke of death, Their mother, Maria and Elizabeth, their aunt, and Branwell all died within a relatively short space of years. Emily herself was to die when she was thirty, closely followed by Anne. And Charlotte survived them only for seven rather lonely years. The parsonage was never far away from the churchyard.

Emily feels acutely the negation of death; robbing us, as it does, of the living particulars of a cherished existence. And yet she seems also to yearn for death as the only gate through which she could reach that fulfilment for which she hungered. The abominable character given to Heathcliffe in *Wuthering Heights* does not effectively mask the fact that he is a symbol—probably unintended—for something in Emily herself. Heathcliffe's passion for Catherine—his driving desire to possess her and be possessed by her in a supra-physical way which is yet physical in its urgency—is too demonic to have been able to be satisfied in a happy marriage. The macabre story of his plan to ensure that after death his body would mingle with hers in decay is unforgettably effective in presenting a need for union which could overcome frustration only through death. Emily, who knew that death would rob her of so much that she loved, seems also to have felt that only through death could she belong as intimately as she wished to that Being which caused her such delight in all its manifestations on Haworth Moor. To put it in language which she would never have used, it is as if she felt that immolation as well as oblation was a necessary step on the road to ultimate union.

In one of the last issues of *Scrutiny* to be published, Dr Leavis compared Emily's best-known poem (usually given the title "Remembrance") with a poem on a similar theme by Thomas Hardy. Emily's poem has lines, like the opening, "Cold in the earth, and the deep snow piled above thee", which are superbly memorable. Hardy's (called "After a Journey") is less obviously impressive. Dr Leavis, however, considered Hardy's the more satisfactory poem. It has, he maintained, a great advantage in reality, and it represents a profounder and completer sincerity. It seems to me that Dr Leavis, by patient and detailed analysis, made his point convincingly. Emily's poem is, as he sought to demonstrate, rhetorical self-dramatization; while Hardy's is sensitively close to a lived experience. And the fabric of words out of which the two poems are respectively woven, is affected accordingly. And yet I confess that if it came to a choice between the two I would rather sacrifice Hardy's poem than Emily's.

There are lines in "Remembrance" which, by their "timbre" as well as their sense, suggest the presence of a more intense imaginative vision, as well as a deeper spiritual experience, than anything of which Hardy was capable.

> "But when the days of golden dream had perished
> And even Despair was powerless to destroy,
> Then did I learn how existence could be cherished,
> Strengthened and fed without the aid of joy."

There is rhetoric here, and the diction is undistinguished, but the lines contain a deeper insight than anything in the more satisfactorily achieved Hardy poem.

Mr and Mrs Hanson tell how, "One evening, in the dining-room, Mary (Taylor) said that someone had asked her what her religion was, and she had replied that this was between God and herself. Emily, who was lying on the hearth-rug, looked up at this and said, 'That's right'. These two words were Emily's only contribution to the subject." She is not much more explicit about her own beliefs in her written work. She never sermonized, as Charlotte did.

The scarcely credible Joseph, in *Wuthering Heights*, is sufficient evidence of Emily's contempt for that evangelical "blessed assurance" religion to which her aunt, Miss Branwell, had been tiresomely and unattractively addicted. Joseph, sure that he himself is one of the elect, uses his large Bible only as a comforting arsenal of curses divinely uttered against everyone of whom he disapproves. Through the character of the servant Ellen, however, that religion of sober piety and duty which the English country churches have always nourished, is present as a continuing background. It is a religion of acceptance. Emily seems to assume its validity at its own level, but it is plain that she herself would have found the spiritual fare provided at Haworth Church not only inadequate, but largely irrelevant to her own needs. What Emily did with her solitariness poems like the one about the stars (page 225 in the Oxford Edition of the Complete Poems) bear witness.

Haworth Parsonage did not provide a very happy life for any of its inmates. Psychologists, public health officials and educationists would all have good cause to be shocked at the conditions in which the Brontë children grew up. But Haworth Parsonage did something for Charlotte and Emily which a more "enlightened" home would not have done, and which no modern home could do. It *concentrated* life, and thereby had something to do with that tension in their best work which gives it distinction. Nowadays we are stimulated from an early age in so many different ways, and we enjoy such an undisciplined vicarious experience, that our emotions are weakened through being dissipated. We could care less, no doubt, but not all that much less. Moreover, when we are faced with a situation which looks impossible, we usually have avenues of escape open to us. There were no avenues of escape at Haworth Parsonage, and none of the girls looked for one. That is part of the reason for their achieve-

ment, which is moral as well as artistic. Compulsory education, cheap newspapers and periodicals, ubiquitous advertisement, films, radio, and above all the enormous increase in mobility, have all combined to destroy the kind of tightly packed pockets of existence which used to provide fertile ground for the development of some types of genius. Haworth was one such tightly packed pocket. It was not a wide world; but neither was it superficial; and it was intensely experienced. Physical isolation was not alone responsible for the concentration. The narrow religious assumptions of the home—though both Emily and Charlotte grew beyond them—and the tremendous moral seriousness resulting, added its cement to the cohesiveness of the Brontë experience. The old man in his study had something to do with it. So also had the continuing threat of sickness and death, like an overhanging crag, together with the inescapable, harrowing proximity of Branwell's moral and physical degeneration. The close texture of personal relationships within the family, which made the girls feel as strangers whenever they were away from home, is evidence of more than mutual affection. They knew where they belonged. And, of course, Haworth Moor was there all the time.

Literary periodicals provide abundant evidence that there is to-day a large number of intelligent young men and women, sensitive and well-read, who wish to "be writers". Some of them seem to have all the necessary equipment. The depressing fact is that so often one feels a certain hollowness in the centre. "This man can write, but he has nothing significant to write about. He doesn't care enough." To borrow a phrase fashionable in some theological circles, there is an absence of "ultimate concern". The Brontës did care. They were concerned. I have tried to suggest that this was at any rate partly because of their concentrated world. No writer will get that particular job done for him any more by the conditions in which he lives. That is why I sometimes wonder whether some kind of asceticism will not become a necessity for the serious writer in the world of to-day and to-morrow. It is all very well to spread the jam out, but it can be spread too thin.

F. E. Stalley.

Comparative Religion: New Materials from Africa

Fifteen years ago Bouquet, in his excellent little book on Comparative Religion,[1] wrote: "The exciting thing about the last twenty years is the vast mass of fresh facts which have become available for the study of the history and comparisons of religion." During the last fifteen years a mass of useful data has been accumulated on the subject of African religions, and the Africans themselves have begun to analyse the traditional religion of their own people.

[1] Bouquet, A. C., *Comparative Religion*, Pelican Books, 1942.

The most recent example of work by an African is the doctoral thesis of Abbé Kagamé presented in 1955 at the Gregorian University at Rome. Extracts from it have been published,[1] showing that the author applies the principles of Western classical philosophy to what he claims is the philosophy of his own people living in Ruanda, rejecting what does not apply and indicating any difference where it occurs. The important thing is that at a time when most Christian observers would tend to support the view that traditional African religion is dying out (Parrinder uses the phrase "the twilight of the gods"),[2] there is a growing interest in traditional beliefs and practice by the African intelligentsia. The reason may be found in the close connexion between traditional religion and culture, and the growing tendency to explain the culture. It is probably a cultural urge rather than a religious one which leads the African intelligentsia to wish to interpret African religion and life to the white man.

The whole subject of African religions has received very scanty treatment from scholars working on the comparative study of religions. The reasons are many, but not least was the idea that the comparativist's main concern must be with the great world-religions. African religion, if it be treated at all, was to go into the section on "primitive religions", and was part of the history of religion (though exactly what part is still in doubt) relating to its origins. So we find the controversy about "primitive monotheism" centred upon the question of the age of pygmy culture, or the application of some general theory relating to primitive cultures, like that of the principle of *mana*, to African culture and belief. Seldom, if ever, has the religious belief and practice of African peoples been treated by the comparativists or the historians as a subject worthy of study in its own right. Only Africanists like Dr Edwin Smith, Willoughby, Tauxier, Maupoli and Labouret have made any endeavour to deal with the subject in any depth. The work of Fr Tempels has aroused special interest, not least because it is one of the very few attempts to present a consistent interpretation of Bantu philosophy, but Fr Tempels again is an Africanist and not a comparativist or an historian.

It has long been recognized that the comparative study of religions is largely dependent upon the work of the anthropologists and the archaeologists. Anthropologists to-day are as much concerned with the present as with the past, and their contribution to comparativist study of African religions is more useful than that of the archaeologists. Their work has a relevance to present-day problems which is often lacking in much that is written in the name of comparative religion. Things have changed since Willoughby wrote in 1932 as follows: "In social anthropology, each observer peers into the gloom from his own little coign of vantage, and tells the world what he

[1] Kagamé, Alexis, *La philosophie bantu-rwandaise de l'Etre* (Extraits), Brussels, 1955.

[2] Parrinder, S., *Religion in an African City*, Oxford University Press, 1953, title of Chapter 2.

partly sees and partly infers, and there is no known method of accurately assessing the allowance that ought to be made for his astigmatism or slowness in noting phenomena. Workers in this field are really purveyors of opinion, not of unclad truth—enlightened opinion, perhaps, but still opinion, and a man's opinions are unwittingly coloured by his prepossessions."[1]

This astonishing indictment of the social anthropologists is to-day manifestly untrue. Thanks to anthropologists like Durkheim, Malinowski and Radcliffe Brown, social anthropology has now a tried method of assessing the observed facts, namely the Cultural Method, whereby the society under investigation speaks for itself in its well-defined character as a whole constituted of man and his environment, material and spiritual, without stressing as the early anthropologists had tended to do its having evolved out of something else, or its passing onto something different. This method often takes the anthropologists into the field of comparative religion, as, for example, in the book *African Worlds,* Studies in the Cosmological Ideas and Social Values of African Peoples.[2] Willoughby was expressing the opinion on social anthropology which was common at the time, but the charges he brought are to-day more fittingly levelled against workers in the field of comparative religion, at least in relation to Africa.

The relation between comparative religion and cultural anthropology is such a close one that the comparativist needs to be well acquainted not only with the general trends of thought in the field of cultural anthropology, but also with the practical results of investigation in particular regions. All the available anthropological and linguistic evidence concerning the relevant group of people must come under review, and not just the evidence of what the comparativist may term an "authoritative" source. He usually takes the world as his parish, and, contrary to the view that the world is getting smaller, he may find that at least his card-index file of material on African religions is getting bigger and bigger.

It is doubtful if the method of including sections on each of the most important religions, all in one book, is any longer practicable, at least if the purpose is to do justice to each of them. Even if the method of illustrating one common factor is applied, the question of interpretation arises, since it is unlikely that the most scholarly author will have a complete understanding of each of his references within the context of the particular religion. Even his authorities need careful investigation, and that can be done only by specializing in the relevant culture.

This conflict of method is the basic problem. Bouquet has outlined the various methods employed by comparativists in order to frame what Comte called "a general theory of religion".[1] He says quite

---

[1] Willoughby, W. C., *Nature-Worship and Taboo,* Hartford, Conneticut, Seminary Press, 1932, p. 62.

[2] *African Worlds,* published for the International African Institute by the Oxford University Press, 1954.

[3] Bouquet, op. cit., Chapter XII, General Theories: Epilogue, pp. 293–302.

rightly but inconclusively that he must leave his readers to speculate which of the various general methods he has propounded claims his own allegiance. It is a matter of personal preference rather than of fixed principle, and it is likely to remain so for as long as the comparativist attempts to include all of the manifestations of religious activity within the scope of his researches.

There is a strong case to be made for specialization in the field of African religions, and one would like to see a Chair for this purpose at some Christian college or university. Apart from the importance of the study in its own right, it would provide the help for which the comparativist to-day stands in real need. To illustrate this we may refer to a book published recently by an outstanding Italian scholar, *The All-Knowing God*, by Raffaele Pettazzoni, Professor of the History of Religions at Rome.[2] The author has focused his research on the attribute of Divine omniscience, "considered as an ideological complex and as a religious experience". The thesis of this book is that this omniscience is not originally implicit in the idea of deity generally, but is organically connected with the peculiar nature of all-knowing gods, all-knowing because all-seeing, and all-seeing because they are luminous. "This omniscience is the peculiar property of the sky-god." "Behind the omniscience of the Christian God lies historically the omniscience of Yahweh, and behind Yahweh is historically the sky-god of the pastoral cultures, himself eventually the heir of an all-seeing sky-god of hunting peoples."

The author arranges his material in a roughly geographical series, starting with Central Africa and ending at the extremity of South America, a great curve on the world's globe. He observes only one feature of what he calls the cultural nexus of the different societies, abstracting it to provide more grist to his mill. While accepting his thesis as valid so long as it clearly applies in specific cultures, one is not at all convinced by the evidence from his "authorities" on Africa. Obviously the author is not at home in the African field. In African cultures the idea of a Supreme Being who sees and hears everything cannot be described as a factor common to what he terms "Bantu religion" or "the religion of the Bantu peoples", nor can it be regularly associated with the ideological complex he is concerned to promote. The whole question of the connexion between the attributes of the Supreme Being, which are usually not difficult to identify, with the idea of the Supreme Being needs much further investigation by the specialist before the comparativist can even begin to use the available material. Amongst the Shona, for instance, the common people do not associate the attributes with the Supreme Being, for this is the prerogative of the diviners. Even if we connect the attribute of omniscience with the Supreme Being of the Zulus, it does not form with them part of the religious experience because it has no punitive sanction. These are instances of the need for much

[1] Pettazzoni, R., *The All-Knowing God*, Researches into Early Religion and Culture, English translation by H. J. Rose, Methuen, London, 1956.

more careful investigation before the comparativist can abstract, for his own purposes, particular factors from the cultural nexus.

Historically the religions of the Bantu cannot be considered as a common factor in the transition to a higher form of religion, and yet this is the theory which has so often been put forward by the comparativists and historians. They cannot altogether be blamed for this, because formerly the available material was inadequate and often coloured by unfavourable prepossessions shared by not a few missionary writers. To-day it is clear that the diversity of African religions ranges within Africa, in what comparativists (following Ratzel, Graebner and others) called the different culture-horizons (*kulturkreise*), from the Tribal Horizon to the Civilized Horizon. It is a profound mistake to imagine that the common features of so-called "Bantu religion" can be briefly summarized in the class of religions of the Tribal Horizon. There certainly are some common features, but there are as many fundamental differences. What, for instance, could be a greater contrast than the absence of any traditional belief in a personal Supreme Being amongst the Sotho, with no dogma of divine creation,[1] and the monotheistic belief among the people of Ruanda in a personal creator, possessed of an intelligence, a will, an emotivity?[2] Was the one evolved from the other? By using the cultural method it may be possible to find a correspondence of difference between the cultural environment of both peoples and their differing beliefs.

The comparativist is dependent upon the specialist, but in a field so wide as the African he needs not so much the specialist in the restricted field of one tribe (there are many of these) as the specialist who is concerned with the comparative study of African religions. The increased understanding by the general public of the so-called primitive societies of Africa is eventually corrected and enlarged by the work of cultural anthropologists. Should not the specialist on African religions have his part to play as well? There can be no doubt about the great significance of his work for the world comparison of religions. As to its practical bearing upon our better understanding of African life and thought, this also cannot be doubted. For the missionary this would be the greatest service such work could offer.

LYNDON HARRIES.

Theological Reflections on the Subject of the House Church

THE Halton experiment is sufficiently well known for any further description of it to be superfluous. Not only has Canon Southcott published a full account,[3] to which his article in a previous number

[1] Following Casalis. [2] Following Raquet.
[3] E. W. Southcott, *The Parish Comes Alive*, 1956.

of this journal served as a "trailer",[1] but, more recently, Mr James has given an answer to the question, "What is going on at Halton?"[2] The publication of its details, however, has met with a mixed reception, and whereas many are prepared to consider it with sympathy, its detractors are of the opinion that it has no theological justification. This latter view fails not only to take account of a penetrating article on the subject, also published in THEOLOGY[3] and reprinted almost *in toto* in Canon Southcott's account,[4] but also to appreciate what theological factors are indeed involved. To say that the experiment is one "which traditional Eucharistic theology and precedent cannot justify" and that it "needs a much more authoritative weight of theological evidence than its apologist has been able to give"[5] is to confess one's lack of comprehension. The purpose of this article is to emphasize these implicit theological factors that ignorance can no longer be a ground for disregarding the challenge that Halton presents.

We must begin with the concept of *koinonia*—an untranslatable word which is rendered in three different ways in the Revised Version of the New Testament. The root idea is that of the sharing of a common life and therefore of unity. The basis of *koinonia* is indeed the common life of the Godhead, the unity of Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Hence in the First Epistle of St John it is stated that "our *koinonia* is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ" (1. 3), and that since "God is light" it is only when "we walk in the light" that "we have *koinonia* one with another" (1. 5, 7). The same theme, only differently expressed, is to be found in the Fourth Gospel, where Jesus prays for his disciples "that they may be one, even as we are . . . that they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us" (17. 11, 21). This unity of the Godhead became the foundation of the unity of the faithful through Jesus who is himself the Mediator, i.e. the one in whom God and man are united. He who was God became a sharer in (*kekoinoneken*) and partook of (*meteschen*) our humanity (Heb. 2. 14). There is thus a *koinonia* of man and God in Christ, and of all men with each other in so far as they are in Christ. *Koinonia* is thus both vertical and horizontal, but the latter depends upon the former.

The *koinonia* is actualized at the Eucharist, for "the cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a *koinonia* of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a *koinonia* of the body of Christ? Seeing that we, who are many, are one bread, one body: for we all partake (*metechomen*) of the one bread" (1 Cor. 10. 16, 17). We may relate this Pauline statement with an often quoted saying of St Augustine: "Since you are the Body of Christ and his members, it is your mystery that is placed on the Lord's table; it is your mystery

[1] "The House Church", THEOLOGY, LVI, 1953, pp. 167–71.
[2] THEOLOGY, LX, 1957, pp. 61–5.
[3] J. A. T. Robinson, "The House Church and the Parish Church", THEOLOGY, LIII, 1950, pp. 283–9.
[4] Op. cit., pp. 70–4.
[5] Quoted from the leader in the *Church Times*, 23 November 1956.

that you receive" (*Sermo* 272). "If you have received well, you are that which you have received" (*Sermo* 227). By a legitimate substitution it could equally well be said: "Since you are the *koinonia* of Christ, it is your mystery that is placed on the table . . ." So the Church, which is the *koinonia* of Christ, has *kononia* with the Body and Blood of Christ that it may become what it is.

This is of course only one aspect of the Eucharist, but nevertheless one that is fundamental and one that it is of the utmost importance to emphasize at the present day when a true sense of community, which rests upon unity, is so largely absent. Contemporary society is disrupted and "community" means very little. In this situation it is the Church, and the Church alone, which could and should reveal the true nature of *koinonia*—but does it in fact do so? Unfortunately these words, written seventeen years ago, are still applicable to-day: "The Church has largely failed to exhibit the true principles of community within her own life, and the society which once startled the world by its uniqueness and solidarity is now riddled with the same divisive and disruptive influences which we see at work in society at large. . . . It is a state of affairs to which her devotional life bears tragic witness: the sequences of her worship, pregnant with meaning for life, being both the divine interpretation and the divine standard, impress the average person as a series of persevering charades."[1]

It must be acknowledged that the Parish Communion movement has done and is doing much to remedy this situation, that through it more and more people are coming to a truer understanding of the nature of corporate worship and therefore of *koinonia*. But it is also to be acknowledged that in proportion as the movement succeeds in drawing more individuals into the worship in the church building, the greater becomes the difficulty of realizing *koinonia*. It is an undeniable fact of experience that where two or three hundred are gathered together, the sense of *koinonia*, with all that this means in terms of personal encounter, as distinct from mob psychology, becomes more difficult of attainment. Of course *objectively* the *koinonia* is there, but it must be experienced *subjectively* if it is to become a reality in the life of the Church and so a witness to the world of what community truly is. We may institute Offertory processions: we may have the Comfortable Words read by a member of the laity, and yet it is still possible—and to this the experience of many bears irrefutable testimony—for the individual worshipper to feel isolated and alone amidst a large group of people who are virtually unknown to him and in many instances to one another. The man who has spent his day working in the factory or in the office and is too tired at night or too occupied with his other legitimate interests to join in the social activities of the parish cannot be expected to feel at home with his brothers and sisters in Christ when they are strangers to him, to his interests and to his professional or working life. It is unrealistic not to admit this situation or to suppose that simply to celebrate the

[1] D. G. Peck, *Catholic Design for Society*, 1940, p. 62.

Eucharist in the presence of large numbers will, as if by magic, actualize *koinonia* when there is so much to inhibit the personal response of the individual worshipper. He may experience *koinonia* in its vertical dimension, but its horizontal is likely to remain a closed book.

One remedy, possibly not the only one but others have yet to be devised, is to celebrate the Eucharist in the private house, i.e. the house church provides a possible method of recovering a sense of *koinonia*. In the home, with a few friends gathered from nearby houses, a sense of *natural* community still and already exists. When the parish priest breaks the bread in the home, the natural community is hallowed and true *koinonia* is both objectively and subjectively realized. But this is not the end—as each small *koinonia*, the microcosm of the macrocosm of the Body of Christ, advances and becomes conscious of its being in Christ, it thereby becomes capable of integration with other cells of the Body of Christ, nurtured in other house churches, at the parish Communion in the parish church. So the body of Christ may be built up and may progress towards "the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ" (Eph. 4. 13)—so the *koinonia* may become once more an effective and visible expression of the unity of mankind in our Lord.

It is further germane to our subject to recall that the Eucharist was domestic in origin. It was the family meal of the household of God gathered around the Lord's table. This was and should remain one of its dominating characteristics. It is difficult to conceive of a more suitable way of helping the majority of the faithful to appreciate this than through the house church with its celebration around the family table.

There is a second aspect of *koinonia* that also concerns the subject of the house church. *Koinonia* derives from the adjective *koinos*, meaning common. In the LXX this adjective, precisely because it means common, could also be used of that which is unclean (1 Macc. 1. 47), i.e. it referred to that which is the opposite of holy. The common or profane is that which does not pertain to God; it is thus to be avoided as an hindrance or impediment to man's approach to God. This rigid dichotomy between the sacred and the common was exemplified by the structure of the Temple at Jerusalem, with its surrounding courts insulating the Holy of Holies and separating it from all that might contaminate it. In the New Testament, *koinos* is liberated from its associations with impurity and defilement. So on the roof top at Joppa, St Peter who declares that he has "never eaten anything that is common and unclean", is told that "what God hath cleansed, make not thou common" (Acts 10. 14, 15). This act of cleansing is in fact identical with the redemptive work of Christ "who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify (lit. cleanse) unto himself a people for his own possession" (Tit. 2. 14). Henceforth "nothing is unclean (lit. common) of itself" (Rom. 14. 14). So the dichotomy between the holy and the common has been brought to an end, for the holy has come down to the level of the profane in order that what is common may be ele-

vated to the level of the holy, i.e. God became man.[1] Hence the veil of the Temple was rent, the middle wall of partition was broken down, and those who are in Christ have become the Temple or Holy of Holies in whom the Spirit of God is pleased to dwell (cp. 2 Cor. 6. 16, where Temple translates *naos*, i.e. sanctuary or Holy of Holies). The presence of God is no longer confined within the Temple building; it came forth into the common life of mankind in the person of Jesus and it remains there through the presence of the Spirit in his members.

To this corresponds another feature of Eucharistic theology. In its earliest beginnings the Eucharist was celebrated in the private house on the common dining-table with an everyday cup and plate and with ordinary food and drink—bread, water and wine. The participant could see for himself and know for himself that by this divinely appointed means, through the simple tokens of his everyday life, that life was sanctified and drawn into the orbit of Christ's redeeming work. God, who in Christ had met man at the level of his day-to-day existence, continued to meet him through his Sacrament. In the *koinonia* of the Church and through the *koinonia* of the Body and Blood all that was *koinos* was hallowed.

This essential connexion between worship and life is little appreciated by many in our congregations to-day. For the majority, though not possibly for all, worship is something that is done on a Sunday which neither sums up the activities of the preceding week days nor sets the tone of those to follow. Worship, too, is something that takes place in a special building and is no necessary feature of life in the home. Here we see the dichotomy between the common and the holy once more reasserted—the church building has for many become, as it were, a second Jewish Temple, into which most people never penetrate, and the *koinos* has re-entered its state of unhallowed separation. But the believer in the house church who has seen his table used as the altar of God, who has contributed his bread from his bin and the water from his tap for the Eucharistic offering, can no longer rest content with living his life on two levels, with separating his religion and his life into two distinct compartments. He knows, in a way that no amount of sermonizing will bring home to him, that in the *koinonia* of the Church and through the *koinonia* of the Body and Blood the whole of creation ceases to be *koinos* and becomes *hagios*.

These two theological factors—the actualization of the *koinonia* and the repudiation of false ideas of the holy by sanctifying that which is *koinos*—are implicit in the Halton experiment. No congregation which is alive to the message of the Incarnation can fail to acknowledge their importance, and no one who has witnessed the house church in operation can fail to acknowledge that therein they are to be seen at work.

J. G. Davies.

[1] Cp. the letter by J. A. T. Robinson, Theology, LVI, 1953, pp. 303–5.

Studies in Texts: Luke 10. 29

"But he, desiring to justify himself, said unto Jesus, 'And who is my neighbour?' "—St Luke 10. 29.

THE doctrine of justification by faith does not come alive easily as presented in the abstract by its chief exponent St Paul. Can it be approached, imaginatively and man to man rather than theologically, by dwelling on the one incident in the Gospel story in which we read of a lawyer in the presence of Jesus "desiring to justify himself"?

Humanly speaking we owe it to this alone that we have the record of the Good Samaritan. "Desiring to justify himself" the lawyer went on to ask "Who is my neighbour?" Anyhow, he did the world a good turn thereby. But, that apart, can we be sure that he approached Jesus as an opponent, as is suggested by the rendering, "he stood up and tempted him"? The same Greek word is used equally in the neutral sense of testing, making trial of. There were others of the Jewish hierarchy, like Nicodemus, attracted but by no means committed, who were led to make contact with the new Teacher who had no known credentials. So far as words go, there was nothing offensive in the first question, "Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" And it is remarkable that his reply to the counter-question of Jesus, "What is written in the law? How readest thou?" brought together the two commandments of love towards God and love towards the neighbour, which in the Old Testament are found only separately. Thereby he earned the approving answer, "This do and thou shalt live". It was at this point that we read, "he, desiring to justify himself, asked, 'Who is my neighbour?' "

As suggested above, even were the motive behind the question hostile, Jesus turned the question to good account. But, in the circumstances, the motive recorded was what one would expect. No debater, however set on truth, is altogether free from the desire to justify himself; and here was a man engaged in a theological debate with one who for all he knew was a teacher with less rather than more authority than himself. We need not therefore assume that the lawyer was convinced that he had nothing whatever to learn from Jesus, and knew himself justified not only by his knowledge, but also by his keeping of God's law. Further, even if he had approached Jesus as an out-and-out opponent, it is at least possible that the presence of Jesus and his courteous replies had begun to shake his self-confidence, and that the question "Who is my neighbour?" had therefore behind it a genuine desire to draw out the new Teacher further—and perhaps learn from him—the desire for self-justification no longer based entirely on the past, but looking on to what Jesus might have to give him.

Anyhow, we are told of no outcome of the incident, positive or negative. The lawyer may have been in opposition from beginning to end. But it is at least possible that, if not immediately, little by little—as must have been the hope of Jesus all through—the lawyer

came to acknowledge in Jesus sublime and ultimate truth, and became a nameless disciple and even an unknown apostle.

While this particular outcome is purely imaginary, it rings true to the kind of way in which thousands have become convinced Christians, in one way or another "saved" by Christ, "justified" only by their faith in him as the God-given interpreter of God. So we find ourselves, certainly only on the threshold, but ready to consider more sympathetically the more comprehensive grounds on which St Paul builds up the doctrine of justification by faith—faith which because it is a response to divine initiative in and through Christ is the acceptance of a divine gift—faith which is not so much man's acceptance of Christ as his acceptance of Christ's prior acceptance of himself.

E. S. G. Wickham.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr Shepherd is Professor of Liturgics in the Church Divinity School of the Pacific, Berkeley, California.

The Rev. F. E. Stalley is Vicar of Market Rasen, Lincs.

Dr Harries is Lecturer in Swahili at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.

Dr Davies is Senior Lecturer in Theology in the University of Birmingham.

The Rev. E. S. G. Wickham was formerly Principal of Knutsford Test School.

CORRESPONDENCE

"NATURAL JOY AND THE CHRISTIAN"

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

Instead of marring an otherwise excellent article on Christian joy by an unnecessary and doubtfully valid dig at the Puritans, a less imperfect understanding of the Puritan experience would have led Mr Reckitt to discern among them shining examples of the reality of Christian joy no less convincing than that which animated saints such as St Teresa and St Philip Neri. He might have found a perfect quotation, cited in an essay by Dr E. I. Watkin, on one of the most cheerful of them, Thomas Goodwin, whom he praises for his warm attachment to the Sacred Humanity of Jesus (*Poets and Mystics*, 1953). The quotation is one of several from Peter Sterry, a Puritan of the Puritans and Cromwell's favourite divine. "Abide in the Father's love by spiritual joy. Joy is love flaming. One saith that laughter is the dance of the spirits, their freest motion in harmony and that the light of the heavens is the laughter of Angels. Spiritual joy is the laughter of Divine Love, of the eternal Spirit, which is love, in our spirits." Dr Watkin adds: "What was wrong with the

religion of these left-wing Puritans was not that it was harsh, legalistic, terrorist—it was spiritual, tender and loving, often mystical in tendency—but that it was excessively and one-sidedly individualistic. . . ."

The myth that the outlook of the Puritan was one of consistent gloom has been examined and found wanting by James Moffatt, Percy Scholes, and others.

Yours faithfully,
ARTHUR H. DRIVEN.

BARROW HILL,
CHESTERFIELD.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAD SIR,

Mr Reckitt has written, perhaps deliberately, a most provocative article. There appears to be an element of dualism in his approach to the theme. I was struck, in particular, by his reference to the Puritan "suspicion of all pleasure on principle". Reflecting upon this, I turned instinctively to that saint in Umbria who bore upon his body the wound marks of love. Was Joy the fiery seraph who pierced the hands and feet and side of Francis? He found no barrier between natural and supernatural joy. Surely to him all things *were* in the mind of God, and therefore to be enjoyed and worshipful.

There is, however, a tendency in fallen man to mistrust happiness, to fear the embrace of joy. "Is there a catch in it somewhere?" he asks. Perhaps it is only the child, living in the present moment, and those poets in whom the child remains, who respond eagerly and spontaneously. Was it then the Puritans, chilled by the bleak breath of predestination, who instilled this fear? Or does it spring from Pelagius and his heirs, more with us to-day than are the poor, who, finding no support from their own boot straps, despair? Certainly this rejection is everywhere apparent. All through this glorious summer we have often heard, "Oh, yes, it's glorious now, but we shall have to suffer for it later on!" Probably the source of this mistrust lies deeper, as the psychologists and anthropologists assert; but, however that may be, it is certain that Joy springs from the very fount of consciousness, from an awareness of, and delight in, creatures other than the self. It is the fulfilment of the "I and thou" of the coinherence. Yet Joy cannot be grasped, exploited or captured; indeed—

> "He who bends to himself a joy,
> Doth the winged life destroy;
> But he who kisses the joy as it flies,
> Lives in eternity's sunrise."

It is significant that Hitler, apparently the very antithesis of joy, recognized its great power in his attempt to exploit it to weld his young men into a great steam-roller of power with his "Strength

through Joy" movement. England, and other nations too, might have fared worse but for the fact that the genius who is Winston Churchill enjoyed his immense task. As a joyous adventurer he entered upon it, and told the country what it would cost. The abiding power of joy sustained him, and us, to spend and be spent, to endure to the end, to save and be saved. Surely Joy is one of the Great Powers of the universe—that of which our Lord told us "no man taketh it from you". Has Mr Reckitt drawn an imaginary thick black line perhaps when seized by what he describes as one of those "moods . . . which do invade many of us at times"? Let us hope it may soon be erased from his own joyful mind.

Yours faithfully,
VIOLET WELTON.

[Another correspondent calls attention to the fact that Mr Reckitt made no reference to the three university sermons by Dr E. W. Williamson, late Bishop of Swansea and Brecon, published by S.P.C.K. in 1946 under the title *An Anatomy of Christian Joy*. One of the sermons, "Cheerfulness breaks in", had been previously published in THEOLOGY, March 1945.—ED. THEOLOGY.]

A NATIONAL MISSION?

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I have read with much interest your editorial notice of the Archdeacon of London's book, *Message for a Mission*. You comment on the Archdeacon's proposal for a national mission. That is the first proposal which he makes, and, as you point out, it is worthy of careful consideration. But you do not mention the Archdeacon's second proposal, and, in my opinion, the latter proposal is an essential part of the program which he advocates.

The Archdeacon proposes that the distinctive message of the mission should be the proclamation of a Christian ideology. Such an ideology would be a systematic presentation of the Christian pattern for society, and it would be based on "the central theme of the teaching of Christ, which is the Kingdom of God". It is not enough for the Church to aim at the conversion of individuals. There is now an urgent need for a social gospel concerned with "the salvation and re-creation of society as a whole, whether 'society' be thought of as the family, the nation, or the world". The formulation of a Christian ideology should be "accepted as a corporate commitment by Christian scholars", and its proclamation should be the specific object of a national mission.

You rightly emphasize the need for "a good deal of discrimination to be made between different kinds of 'mission' ". The mission proposed by the Archdeacon of London would certainly be different from anything hitherto attempted on a national scale. It would be

different in its method, because the missioners would all be briefed from a centre. And it would be different in its message, because it would seek to present effectively a Christian ideology which would speak to "the condition of communal man".

Yours very truly,
G. J. Inglis.

CELIBACY

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

If I may make a tardy contribution to the discussion on celibacy, it seems to me that the introduction of the idea of "vocation to the married life" only obscures a simple issue and drags the argument down from the New Testament level to that of the bourgeois world of the C. of E. parson.

When talking to a Rotary Club one can talk of "the business man's vocation"; rich people can sigh of the difficulties of having a "vocation to be wealthy", and in the same way one can talk about the "vocation" to married life, but this is not using the word vocation in the sense normally implied in religious circles. Marriage is the normal human condition—part of the setting into which a call from God can come, though it may play havoc with one's married life if it is accepted, as one guesses that it did with St Peter. In the N.T. wives are counted among the things that may be given up for the sake of the Kingdom of God. Peter, being married, remained married, but one doesn't imagine that if he had been single he would not have remained so, for the call is to "forsake all and follow me".

The sight of a pair of lovers embracing brings joy to the heart, but when one of the pair is a priest it brings only a sense of incongruity, because surely the idea of the priest includes the idea that all the passion and desire that might have been poured out on some woman have been poured out on God, and are given back to humanity in a love that does not select a particular person for special favours, but is bestowed on all such of God's children as will receive it.

St Paul states the matter more prosaically: "He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord, but he that is married careth for the things of the world, how he may please his wife."

If there is such a thing as an apostolic succession it implies an apostolic life. The apostle must, as far as possible, be classless, family-less, root-less, free for the missionary task, whether it be Tooting or Timbuctoo. As soon as he is married he becomes middle class, beginning to think of his "rights"—his right to live in "decent comfort", to send his children to a "decent school"—by which he means a school more decent than his working-class parishioners can afford. He has to have "time to be with his family", when really his parish is a family that needs all his time.

No one, I presume, wants to make it a rule that Anglican clergy

must not marry. But every ordinand should have the challenge put to him in clear tones, not confused by the vested interests of those who have already accepted the married state.

Yours sincerely,
A Mission Priest.

Korea.
8 *July* 1957.

ORDINANDS' FIANCÉES

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

Perhaps, when C.A.C.T.M. have completed their organization of ordinands, as suggested by Mr Miller in your August number, and the Mothers' Union the suggested fellowship of their fiancées, another body might also be set up for young ladies, preferably daughters of clergy, and other stalwarts from the fields of faith, without any other ideas in their heads (especially didactic ones which can be so annoying in clergy wives), who are not yet the fiancées of ordinands, but who would like to become so. I believe that such a body exists in Greece, but the regulations there about the marriage of ordinands might rather confuse the Principal of Cuddesdon. It would, however, make it so much easier for ordinands like myself, who would prefer a wife to be a wife, and not just an extra underpaid, or unpaid, curate.

Yours faithfully,
Philip S. Hutchinson.

Theological College,
Chichester.

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH IN CANADA

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

The Letter from Canada in the July issue of Theology by the Rev. G. D. White attempts a critical review of recent trends within the Anglican Church of Canada.

A number of the writer's observations, based, it would appear, on hearsay and newspaper reports, are presented with an Olympian authority which is unsupported by the facts. Some of the information is definitely misleading, and the caustic comments by which the article is characterized are indicative more of immaturity and irresponsibility than of sound judgment. In fact, the judgment of Theology may be questioned in opening its columns to this ill-balanced piece of reporting.

To set the record straight, it should be stated that, whereas the Canadian Church has indeed been nourished richly by the Mother Church in England, both in clergy and financial support, and will ever be grateful for this heritage, it has for many years developed a

vigorous life of its own and has enjoyed steady progress. Because in recent decades it has not been predominantly "a Church of Englishmen settled in Canada", General Synod repeatedly debated since 1915 the question of "a suitable name for the Church". The problem of finding a name, which would retain the historic genius of the Church and yet disclose its indigenous character, was solved at the General Synod of 1955 in the title "The Anglican Church of Canada", adopted by an overwhelming majority of the members.

Conversations with the United Church of Canada were not initiated due to the fact that "rising national feeling caused some Anglicans to wonder if there was any place for a Church of England in Canada". The Synod of 1943, in obedience to our Lord's expressed will for his Church, "That they may all be one", and inspired by the Faith and Order and Reunion Movements of the British and Continental Churches, issued a general invitation to all communions in Canada to enter upon conversations on the question of the reunion of Christendom. The United Church of Canada responded to this invitation and sought, in prayer and study, with the Anglican Church to explore all conditions necessary to full organic union of the two communions. The plan of the "mutually acceptable ministry", proposed in 1946, was not favoured, but the decision to defer development of this particular plan did not preclude further study of the subject. Notwithstanding marked apathy and indifference on the part of the general membership of both communions, and the hostility of certain groups in each, the national assemblies of the two Churches, in obedience to our Lord's will, have authorized continuance of the conversations. The Executive Council of 1956 instructed the Committee on Reunion "to pursue with vigour its consultations with the United Church of Canada and again seek to initiate similar consultations with other Christian bodies".

Your correspondent declares that at the General Synod of 1955 "a revision of the Prayer Book was approved". The Draft Prayer Book at that time was given "general approval", and for purposes of information and study certain services therein were authorized for occasional use under the direction of the Ordinary. The book was referred back to the Revision Committee for revision and correction and the Committee was instructed to present the book in amended form at the next General Synod in the light of the suggestions received from the membership of the Church for revision in content. The Committee has received many hundreds of suggestions and will submit the book, in final form, to the 1959 session of the Synod. If accepted by this Synod and authorized for use throughout the Church the book will require a ratifying authority at the Synod of 1962 before it officially replaces the one now in use. The Revision Committee, in its labours, has not sought "a middle way between the American and English usages", but, in the light of *all* recent liturgical study and acutely mindful of the heritage of the centuries, has attempted to produce a Prayer Book which is thoroughly consonant with the best in Catholic tradition and Anglican practice.

Despite the confident assertion that at the General Synod of 1955

"the perennial problem of the Primatial See was settled", the question, as was revealed at the Executive Council of 1956, is still very much under debate. The General Synod did, in fact, give instruction to establish a Primatial See "in the vicinity of the nation's capital, Ottawa". The Primatial See Commission, appointed to carry out this instruction, reported that, in its opinion, the Synod's plan "is unworkable and should be abandoned", and asked for a widening of the terms of reference, "so that other plans for the establishment of a Primatial See in a suitable location may be studied". The Council instructed the Commission to continue its studies "within the spirit of the resolution of General Synod". At this year's Council meeting the Commission will renew its request for a widening of the terms of reference.

Other parts of Mr White's report on the state of the Anglican Church in Canada may be challenged, but space forbids, except possibly a refutation of the last clause in the assertion that "relations with the Church of England remained closer than with the American Episcopal Church, and this is still the case". There has been for a number of years a cordial and growing relationship between the Anglican Church of Canada and the Protestant Episcopal Church, U.S.A., both in official and personal communication, and in program activities. Such relationship by no means is prejudicial to the continued and affectionate relationship with the Mother Church in England.

Sincerely,
H. R. Hunt,
General Secretary,
The General Synod of the
Anglican Church in Canada.

600 Jarvis Street,
Toronto, Canada.

OFFERTORY AND OBLATION

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

Brother George Every has made a really important contribution to this discussion by the clear distinction which he draws between the *preparation* of the Eucharistic elements and the *offering* of them. He is quite right in saying that in one of the passages which he quotes from my *Corpus Christi* I had fallen into a confusion. I am furthermore delighted that he agrees with my identification of the offering with the consecration.

I do not, however, agree that, from my view, it follows that "what the Church offers is bread and wine, in remembrance of the death and passion, the resurrection and ascension of Christ". Just because (in words which Brother Every quotes from me), "there is one prayer, the great Eucharistic thanksgiving, which simultaneously consecrates and offers in one action", what is offered is *both* bread and wine *and* the Body and Blood of Christ, since *in the very act of*

offering the former are transformed into the latter. However, to describe the offering in all its fulness, one surely ought not to exclude the Lord himself from the act of offering or the Church from the object that is offered. I should be content to say simply that in the Eucharist the Whole Christ is offering the Whole Christ; for Head and members are one Body, and neither under the aspect of *offerens* nor under that of *oblatum* ought the one to be thought of in separation from the other. This is, I would suggest, the key to the Eucharistic doctrine of St Augustine, with his insistence that *we* are on the altar and in the chalice, and that, in that which the Church offers, she herself is offered.

Yours faithfully,
E. L. MASCALL.

CHRIST CHURCH,
OXFORD.
15 *August* 1957.

PAPER CHURCH

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I have now completed the forms prior to Ordination. I wonder if it would interest readers of "Paper Church" (THEOLOGY, February 1957) to share my estimate of time and cost involved in repeating information to authority. Perhaps then someone could explain the purpose.

To repeat information which the diocese already possesses I have collected 27 signatures and addressed over 30 envelopes. This has cost over a pound and taken some 10 hours. It is impossible to calculate the time wasted by Church officials in assisting me and then to multiply this by 450-odd candidates.

In 5 years' training I have sat 135 hours of theological examination, almost entirely set and marked by Anglicans. Yet I am still required to sit 3 three-hour essays, and provide an invigilator, as "proof of my qualifications".

Yours, etc.,
"ORDINAND."

DIVORCE

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Lady Oppenheimer is surely right in saying that Holy Communion should not be withheld as a "penal" measure from those who have remarried after divorce. It seems equally true to me, however, that the drift of her article might still lead to exclusion as well as to admission. On the showing of this article a person who remarries has dissociated himself from the spirit of the Christian fellow-

ship—the "Way" of Christ's teaching—and that by a public and official act.

The possibility of admission depends on the possibility of repentance, and here the irrevocability of the second "marriage" appears to stand in the way. Is this necessarily so? Repentance on the part of a murderer will not alter the fact that a life has been taken, any more than repentance of a remarried person would alter the fact that a marriage has been adulterated. Yet Holy Communion is not denied to a repentant murderer. Does the analogy hold? If so, one could not announce that Holy Communion will be open to all remarried people, as this would open the gate wide to presumptuous sinning; but it might be possible to admit those of whose will to repentance some competent authority was reasonably assured. By "will to repentance" I mean a real facing of the wrongfulness of the act, contrition for it, and a willingness to face the duty of loving and cherishing the partner whom one recognizes that one has wrongfully taken. I hope that someone more competent than I will examine these suggestions. It has seemed to me for some time that the clue to Christian teaching and practice on remarriage and its diseases lies in the recognition that it belongs to exactly the same category of events as birth and death; these events seem to me to stand apart from all other categories of human behaviour and to require their own special standards of treatment.

Yours faithfully,
A. M. Newman.

Gorefield Vicarage,
near Wisbech.
15 *August* 1957.

[Further letters on this subject will appear next month.—Ed. Theology.]

BOOK REVIEWS

The Epistle to the Romans. By C. K. Barrett. A. and C. Black. 25s.

Contributors to the new series of Black's New Testament commentaries have been set a high standard by this opening volume, a careful and thorough wrestling with the text of Romans. Educated laypeople, as well as clergymen, ministers and theological students, will learn much from this commentary.

The introductory material runs to thirteen full pages; in this compass there is little room for qualifications; for instance, Paul's rabbinical education is an open question; and Dr Barrett takes the conventional view that Romans is addressed to a predominantly Gentile church. He is, however, right to hold that the letter is written for a particular occasion; Dr John Knox (*New Testament Studies*, II (1955–6), pp. 191 ff.) has suggested that it is an example of the type

of letter addressed by Paul to Gentile churches of others' foundation in virtue of his recognized status (Gal. 2. 9, Rom. 11. 13); this will hardly do, and the orderliness of Romans admits of explanation otherwise. Knox's suggestion goes some way towards solving the textual difficulties of Romans; Barrett concludes a judicious summary of the text of chs 14 to 16 in favour of Lietzmann's hypothesis, discarding the erratic evidence of the Chester Beatty papyrus.

The commentary proper is based on Barrett's own translation, which is modern without being offensive; he occasionally slips in a phrase to ease the joints of the argument; he has some homely touches ("yes, but, my dear sir, who are you to answer back to God?" 9. 20). The exegesis can be followed by those without Greek, though there are admirable notes on the Greek words, and discussions of the main variant readings are in footnotes. Barrett has absorbed the work of the great succession of commentators on Romans, but he has gone behind the works of recent scholarship to the three giants among Protestant commentators—Calvin, Luther and Barth. Their work controls the theology of the commentary, perhaps unhappily in the discussions of natural theology, mysticism and typological exegesis. The strongest feature is the patient, detailed study of the epistle, and the reader will do well to work through Romans again with Barrett as guide. On a larger scale there is less of value, and little is provided by way of comparison between Romans and other epistles. A good section on the "strong" and "weak" Christians in chs 14 and 15 would gain from a comparison with 1 Cor. 8–10; it is not clear that Paul is consistent throughout these passages. Doubtless reasons of space have dictated that something be jettisoned.

English students will probably want to compare the present volume with Dr Dodd's in the Moffatt series (1932). There will be room for both volumes on the shelf. There can be no doubt that Barrett's comments keep closer to the minutiae of Paul's text; Dodd tends to be stronger on a larger canvas. The treatment here of "the wrath of God" is more faithful to Pauline theology than Dodd's impersonal conception. We should expect a strongly eschatological exposition from Barrett, in view of his essay on Hebrews, and this leads to a less directly sacramental and ecclesiological interpretation of "in Christ" and "the body of Christ" than we find in Dodd. In his section on chs 9 to 11, Barrett quotes a parallel from *Sanhedrin* X, 1 in support of a representative interpretation of "all" and "fulness" in 11. 25 f., as against Dodd's universalist reading; but Paul himself, in the context of his thought as a whole and remembering his use of the "potter" image with its O.T. background of repentance, seems to have accepted the universalist conclusion.

Lastly, the exposition serves as a much-needed corrective to popular currents in theology. I am not now thinking of the truth that "all is of God"; the preacher or confessor, who is tempted to give Pelagian exhortation or advice, will ever return to Romans to remember this. But here the point is repeated that for Paul "salvation" lies in the future; and it is made clear what caution is needed in talking of the present resurrection-life of Christians, a popular

topic derived from ill-digested reading of some of Dodd's work; Barrett must allow for Col. 3, 1, but his warning is necessary; to see how easily Paul's teaching can be misunderstood, one may look at 2 Tim. 2. 18; F. L. Cross, *The Jung Codex* (1955), pp. 54 ff. Altogether this is a splendid opening to what promises to be a good series.

Derek W. Allen.

St Stephen's House,
Oxford.

The Problem of History in Mark. By James M. Robinson. S.C.M. Press. 8s.

A Paraphrase of St Mark. By Richard Tatlock. Mowbrays. 4s.

Concordance of the Synoptic Gospels in Seven Colours. By Xavier Léon-Dufour, S.J. Desclée and Co. N.p.

The Archbishop of York wrote recently: "It is unscientific to assume that there was in the early Church no interest in 'the life of Jesus as such', in 'just history' or (in a measure) 'just biography' " (*The York Quarterly*, May 1957, p. 7). Mr J. M. Robinson, in his very useful and suggestive monograph, investigates what sort of interest Mark had in history. Mark, he says, "finds meaning and divine action in history, and therefore intends to be recording history" (p. 12); "it is only by defining Mark's understanding of history that a centre of interpretation can be located which does justice both to Mark's history of Jesus and to Mark's religious experience" (p. 15).

Mr Robinson examines the Marcan introduction (1. 1–13), the exorcism narratives, and the debates, and shows that the common theme which runs through them is the conflict between God and evil. "The history which Mark selects to record is presented in its unity as the eschatological action of God, prepared by John the Baptist, inaugurated at the baptism and temptation, carried on through the struggles with various forms of evil, until in his death Jesus has experienced the ultimate of historical involvement and of diabolic antagonism. In the resurrection the force of evil is conclusively broken and the power of God's reign is established in history. It is in this way that Mark understands Jesus' history" (p. 53).

He goes on to consider Mark's attitude to the history of the Church, in which he finds a continuation of the same conflict within world-history; and finally to study "fear", "faith", understanding", etc., in this gospel. The book is written in a rather difficult style, but it raises some of the fundamental questions for gospel study; and it should have the result of making it scientific to assume in future that Mark (at least) had no interest in "the life of Jesus as such", in "just history", or "just biography".

I cannot commend Mr Tatlock's *A Paraphrase of St Mark*. First because, although the Archbishop-designate of Cape Town says in a Foreword that "the author is no mean student of Greek and of the Vulgate" and that the paraphrase "is securely anchored to the best

authorities", nevertheless the principles of textual criticism on which it seems to be based are indefensible. See, for example, 1. 41 ("Jesus' heart filled with tenderness"), 8. 26 ("Jesus now sent the man home, and told him to go *straight there*, and not to go through the village at all"), 9. 29 ("This kind of healing can only be done through prayer and fasting"), 9. 49 ("For fire is the salt which seasons every sacrifice"), 15. 28 (". . . thus making one of the Scriptures come true which says, 'He was put in the same class as criminals' "). Worst of all, he prints 16. 9–20 with no note or warning that this paragraph is an addition to the gospel, not by any means "securely anchored to the best authorities". Oddly enough, on the other hand, Mark 8. 1–9, 14–21 have been omitted.

Secondly, I would have thought that if Mark needs to be paraphrased rather than translated, then it is not so much the *narrative* that needs filling out as the *sayings* of the Lord and the *terms* which are used; whereas what Mr Tatlock has done is precisely the opposite: the *sayings* and *technical terms* (Anointed One, Son of Man, Kingdom of God, "my blood of the New Testament", etc.) remain more or less as they would in a translation, but the *narrative* is embellished with superfluous detail.

Thirdly, the (wholly praiseworthy) attempt to put Mark into contemporary speech has not, to my mind, succeeded; it has had the result of making the matter seem superficial and cheap. The following example (by no means the worst) may illustrate both this impoverishment and the addition of unnecessary embellishments, together with other aspects of the paraphrase for which it should be severely criticized (e.g. accuracy and style):

> The same day that Jesus had been talking to his friends about divorce and re-marriage, some people came to his lodgings with some of their little children; they wanted him to bless them. But his disciples didn't wish him to be disturbed, and rebuked the people who brought them.
>
> When Jesus saw this, he was furious, and said, "Let those children come to me at once, and don't you dare to stop them. The Kingdom of Heaven [*sic*] will be made up [*sic*] of children like these. Because anyone who doesn't receive the Kingdom of God like a little child, shall never enter into it, and that's the plain truth." And he took the children in his arms, and laid his hands on them and gave them his blessing (pp. 43 f.).

There is also a number of printer's errors.

Professor Léon-Dufour's *Concordance* consists mainly of three large folders, one for each synoptic gospel, ingeniously displaying the paragraphs of each gospel in such a way (i.e. by use of colour, numbers and other signs) that any synoptic pericope can be seen as it stands in its own gospel and in its relation with the other two. This might be a useful book for theological students, though it is possible that it might take them longer to understand the professor's system than to become acquainted with the contents of the synoptic gospels.

JOHN C. FENTON.

WENTWORTH, ROTHERHAM.

THE DOCTRINE OF RECONCILIATION (CHURCH DOGMATICS, Volume IV, 1). By Karl Barth. T. and T. Clark. 50s.

The reader of a volume of *Church Dogmatics* cannot fail to pay tribute to Barth as a great, perhaps the greatest, of theological architects. One is driven to comparison of his work with that, in another sphere, of, say, Liverpool Cathedral as one of the outstanding achievements of the century. We may ask whether it was necessary for Liverpool Cathedral to be so large and likewise complain that the *Dogmatics* is too long; and yet in either case the vastness is not inappropriate to the eternity which is its theme. The importance of this architecture of theology is revealed in this volume particularly in certain observations on the relation between the person and work of Christ and the order in which they should be expounded. Those concerned with the teaching of theology and the preparation of theological syllabuses may well profit from paying attention to this section.

Of trinitarian doctrine there is a fuller presentation in an earlier volume; but in this one the theme is taken up again in relation to the Incarnation. There is an exegesis of the biblical passages which declare the Son to be subordinate to the Father as showing a subordination of relationship within the Trinity, so that the obedience of the Son is an essential aspect of his divinity, as well as the perfection of his manhood. This would seem to be an important contribution to the doctrine of the Trinity at the present time, though there are some points of application of this concerning which doubts are expressed below.

The main theme of Volume IV, both Part 1 and Part 2 (the English translation of the latter still awaits publication), is the doctrine of reconciliation, and Barth attempts to reinstate "substitution" as the doctrine of Atonement *par excellence*, the support in the New Testament for other approaches to soteriology being relegated to a subordinate position. Indeed, Barth goes beyond previous exponents of the substitutionary aspect of the Atonement in his presentation of Christ, first, as the divine "No" to all human life as nonsensical apart from him and doomed to annihilation and, secondly, as the divine "Yes", whereby, as crucified and risen, he replaces the whole of fallen and annihilated humanity both before his time and after, so that in him salvation is bestowed on the whole human race, whether individuals in this life know it by faith or not.

This volume has already excited interest and controversy before its translation and may well prove to be the crucial one of the whole of the *Dogmatics*. As Barth himself writes in a charmingly human foreword, "I have been very conscious of the very special responsibility laid on the theologian at this centre of all Christian knowledge. To fail here is to fail everywhere. To be on the right track here makes it impossible to be completely mistaken in the whole." We must, therefore, at the risk of being charged with attempting to pass judgment before hearing the whole case, raise a few tentative questions and doubts. Is the Christ of Barth's theology true to the New

Testament? Yes, we might answer, if the cosmic Christ of the Pauline Epistles and the Fourth Gospel were the whole picture, though even here we might have some difficulties. But does he give adequate value to the synoptic account, where the essential contingency of our Lord's humanity and of the events of his life and death breaks through, in spite of the conviction of the evangelists themselves that all has been foreordained by God? And we must observe further that in the Synoptics Jesus would appear to say "Yes" to human personality and activity, even in its not fully redeemed state, as well as "No" to human sin. Somehow Christology must hold two contrasting emphases in tension, roughly corresponding to the synoptic and the Johannine. One gets the impression that Barth would agree, and yet that he has in fact minimized the former emphasis in the interests of the great soteriological affirmation that we are made to participate in that event which is the centre and end of all the divine acts.

This is most disturbingly apparent at the very point where he endeavours most to do the synoptic picture justice, in the excursus on the temptation and the agony in the garden of Gethsemane. Not that this and other passages of biblical exegesis are without value. Indeed, they confirm the greatness of Barth as a biblical commentator. But the criticism which many English-speaking theologians are likely to level against these exegetical sections is that they fail to grapple with the historical problem. We see this in the otherwise valuable excursus on the concept of the covenant in the Old Testament, where, however, the historical setting is most inadequately treated, with the consequence that there appears to be little appreciation of the action of God at the Exodus and at other crucial points in Israel's history as in any real sense the "Gospel" for Israel at that time. The Incarnation is the only divine *kairos* that matters, and all other *kairoi* are obliterated by it.

Doubtless there is a difference in the concept of history in British and Continental theology which evokes this criticism and which accounts for Barth's verbal insistence on historical revelation and his apparent disregard for it in the English sense of the word. And yet, if all human history is dismissed as "nonsensical", how can we expect much account to be taken of it in respect to the biblical revelation? We may ask further: How can we expect a theodicy which makes sense?

Barth's position causes him embarrassment at one revealing point, the *sola fide* of the Reformers. *Sola gratia* yes; for God is everything and man is nothing. But how can one give a dynamic content to faith, when all humanity will ultimately be redeemed in Christ with or without faith? Faith is, of course, obligatory for those to whom it is vouchsafed; but it does not seem to affect the final issue, and Barth prefers to speak of "the doctrine of justification" mostly without mentioning the instrumentality of faith. This asserts the truth that God's saving act is prior to our faith; but it is hardly the whole truth, and Barth hardly gives adequate value to the other aspect.

It is a common and not unfruitful approach to expositions of the Atonement to view them in their contemporary political and ideo-

logical setting. This in itself does not question their validity, but rather emphasizes their communicability within the society of their time. If we may venture to take this line with Barth, we may perhaps discern him saying to those who live at the point where the iron curtain falls: "The totalitarian polities of our time are only diabolical distortions of the one true divine totality", and to the existentialists, "Yes, it is true man in himself is nothing; but, as transcended and replaced in Christ, he finds his true being". This fact of Barth's contemporary relevance may make his theology formative for our age and even provide a fighting faith to counter rival ideologies; but its permanent validity is another question.

Dr Bromiley's translation must not be left without appreciation of his herculean task. There are difficult sentences and awkward phrases which no doubt faithfully reflect the difficulty of the author's German, while at times the English rises to the heights of a great theme. Whatever we may say of Barth's teaching as a whole, there are paragraphs and chapters in this book which deserve a place in any anthology of Christian classics.

Tirumaraiyur,
South India.

T. S. Garrett.

The Holy Spirit in Christian Theology. By George S. Hendry. S.C.M. Press. 12s. 6d.

In spite of the oft-expressed desire for more books on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit few writers in recent times have ventured to tackle the subject seriously. But here at last is a treatment which goes far towards the establishment of a basic pattern for the working out of the doctrine and shows clearly what are the main problems which have to be considered in any attempt to relate the doctrine to the life of the Church to-day.

Professor Hendry divides the subject into five sections: the Holy Spirit in relation to Christ, to God, to the Church, to the Word and to the Human Spirit. In the first he is particularly concerned to show that "there is no reference in the New Testament to any works of the Spirit apart from Christ. The Spirit is, in an exclusive sense, the Spirit of Christ." To bear witness to Christ, to make him known to men, to enable them to apprehend him—these are the supreme functions of the Spirit according to the writers of the New Testament. In the second chapter the author turns to the early history of Christian doctrine and to the recent writings of Barth, and by reference to them succeeds in giving a most illuminating exposition of the significance of the *filioque* clause in the Creed. Hendry refuses to exclude the subjective factor from the New Testament witness to the work of the Spirit and concludes therefore that Barth's treatment is inadequate. In fact, he holds that the *filioque* clause, both in its ancient and modern uses, has been a false solution to a real problem. Much more than a *filioque* clause is needed in order to give a satisfactory definition of the relations between God, Christ and the Spirit.

The two chapters on the Church and the Word are extraordinarily interesting. Indeed the chapter on the Word is one of the clearest

and most constructive treatments of the problems of the canon and inspiration and the authority of Scripture that I have read. The general position of these two chapters, with its emphasis on the polarity between the Church and the Word, I find most congenial and convincing. The only serious qualification I would have to make is that I do not find enough attention given to what I would call the "Liberal Catholic" or "Organic Catholic" view of the Church which has received so notable an emphasis in recent biblical theology. To set the Roman Catholic view over against the evangelical-Protestant seems to me to present an over-simplified analysis of the present situation. For whereas I would find myself in agreement with most of Dr Hendry's criticisms of the Roman Catholic view of the Church and of what he calls the Anglo-Catholic view of the Church, I still believe that there is a truly Catholic view, different in certain respects from both of these, and yet not identical with what he defines as the evangelical-Protestant. It is within the Catholic-Evangelical polarity, expressed in relation both to the Church and the Word, that the continuing work of the transcendent Holy Spirit is, I believe, most fully revealed.

The final chapter on the Holy Spirit and the Human Spirit constitutes a most welcome attempt on the part of a theologian who has an intimate acquaintance with the theology of the Reformers and of Barth to set out a view of the human spirit and its place in the Divine economy which is less extreme than theirs and yet which remains true to the general biblical testimony. I have no hesitation in saying that this book is one of the best treatments of the Holy Spirit in Christian theology that is available to-day.

Liverpool. F. W. Dillistone.

Pelagius: An Historical and Theological Study. By John Ferguson. Heffer and Sons. 15s.

Professor Ferguson has aimed in this study of Pelagius, which was awarded the Kaye Prize at Cambridge in 1952, at doing for English readers what de Plinval did for French on a larger scale in 1943—providing a fair account of a notorious "heretic" whose heresy has unduly blackened him in the pages of Church history.

Three introductory chapters set the historical scene in the Church and Empire of the fourth century. The next four recount, fairly enough though not without some minor inaccuracies, the story of the controversy; and the last three deal with the theology of Pelagius as seen in his commentaries on St Paul's Epistles, his contribution to Christian thought, and the general issues of Pelagianism.

It is naturally in these last chapters that the bias with which Professor Ferguson has approached his subject becomes most evident. He makes it quite clear that in his opinion the teaching of Pelagius was *less* heretical than that of St Augustine; and he does this, just as did Julian of Eclanum, by making original sin rather than the nature of grace the "real issue" (p. 184) of the Pelagian controversy. Even

here he fails to note that the crudely individualistic moralism of Pelagius shows no inkling of the truth of mankind's unity "in Adam" —the mystery of human iniquity which Augustine's doctrine so deplorably attempted to rationalize. But there ought to be no doubt that the real issues of the controversy were the grace of God and the freedom of man; and here Professor Ferguson, while admitting the reality of the paradox of Christian experience, goes so far as to claim that the emphasis of Pelagius was less exaggerated in its one-sidedness than was Augustine's (p. 175). He finds "two points at which Pelagius's theology may be justly criticized: the absence of any clear doctrine of the Atonement, and the weakness of his effective belief in the Holy Spirit" (p. 183). He does not seem to have observed that what Augustine meant by the *gratia Dei per Jesum Christum* was the efficacy of the finished work of Christ and the power of Christ's Spirit within the soul to convert and sanctify. The text which for Augustine was conclusive against Pelagius was Rom. 5. 5. Pelagius's own comment on this verse is: "We know the love of God, because he not only has forgiven us our sins through the death of his Son, but also has given us the Holy Spirit *to show us the glory of things to come.*"

It makes one rub one's eyes to read that while Pelagius "reached the heights in his understanding of the kindling power of the love of God", Augustine "seems to have had no conception of a free love springing from and expressing the very nature of God. . . . Pelagius has a far juster awareness that our love springs from the love that is the nature of God, and that we love him because he first loved us" (p. 177). Professor Ferguson, who finds that "on 1 John 4. 8 ff. Augustine has nothing to say apposite", should really look again at the Seventh Homily on St John's Epistle, and the last chapters of the Eighth Book of the *De Trinitate*, and ask himself whether Pelagius ever wrote anything that is not flat and shallow in comparison.

J. Burnaby.

Trinity College,
Cambridge.

Mysticism, Sacred and Profane: An Enquiry into some Varieties of Praeternatural Experience. By R. C. Zaehner. Clarendon Press: Oxford University Press. 42s.

There has been no critical comparative study of mysticism in English since Paul Elmer More's slight, polemic and acute essay, "Christian Mysticism, A Critique", appeared in his volume *The Catholic Faith* (Princeton, 1931), and a vaguer attempt by Baron von Hügel in his study of *The Mystical Element of Religion* (1908). Now comes Professor Zaehner, who holds the Chair of Eastern Religions and Ethics at Oxford, to supply this want; in doing so he provides us with what is, in many ways, the work that has been badly needed, often unknowingly, by most religious teachers and a good many learners. He is equipped with a greater apparatus of learning than either More or von Hügel, comprising a working knowledge of

Sanskrit and Arabic as well as a complete mastery of Persian. Professor Zaehner is after the same hare as these two predecessors (though he does not mention either of them), namely to discover what is the relation of mystical experience to authentic theistic religon and especially to Christianity.

More, after a Calvinist upbringing and a pantheistic humanist period when he learned some Sanskrit and Pali, became a member of the Christian Church and expressed his antipathy to mysticism as a snare to the believer, though he would put up with what he called "mystihood" in Plato and Gregory Nazianzen and with the "quasi-mysticism" of Augustine. For him, full mysticism is of the monist variety which, along with Zaehner, he opposes, and he finds it in Sankara, Plotinus and even in John of the Cross whom Zaehner finds a genuine Christian mystic. Von Hügel earlier had been at pains to distinguish the genuine Christian piety of Catherine of Genoa and her friends from the visions, trances and physical disorders she experienced, and after a long rambling, "hügeling" and cautious discussion proclaimed that for all the similarity of many mystic states to those of drug addicts, epileptics and hysterics, for all the verging of mysticism on the abyss of nothingness and allness—yet, in some form (called the "inclusive type") mysticism is indispensable to religion as a whole.

Zaehner takes up these questions independently. He was prompted by two things. The first is the liability to mistake all experiences which transcend the normal, rational and individual consciousness as the equivalent of union with God or the Beatific Vision. Aldous Huxley had such experiences under the influence of mescalin, recorded in his book *The Doors of Perception*. Professor Zaehner starts with a full examination of Huxley's account and of other examples of induced mystical consciousness of oneness with all things. He calls this pan-en-henism or nature mysticism, and he has himself taken mescalin with results fully recorded in an appendix. Having identified such "pagan" forms and contrasted them with religious forms of mysticism, he then proceeds to find that religious mysticism has again two main types, monist and theistic. The elaboration of these distinctions, with a plentiful array of texts from Christian, oriental and near-Eastern sources, is prompted by the second reason which led him to undertake the task, namely the widespread error that mystical religion is a unified and unifying force among the religions of the world. On the contrary, it varies with the mystic, and Zaehner would agree with More that "each of them, looking back upon the void, after the return to consciousness, will use it to assert the truth of his peculiar philosophy or religion" (cf. Zaehner, p. 203).

There are finer distinctions still. Within the monist type Vedantist absorption in Brahma is different from Samkhya-Yoga which makes for the utter isolation of the self, not its dissolution. Further, in the Hindu tradition there are dualist reactions, as there are monist tendencies in Moslem and Persian religion which are fundamentally dualist or theistic. Further still, manic exaltations like those of John Custance, have such similarities to much religious mysticism that

"Madness" has a chapter to itself. These states, religious or manic, put the devotee in the position of being beyond good and evil, and so obliterate the ethical centrality inherent in the Christian and Moslem faiths. Christian mysticism, too, has its variants. Some, like that of Eckhart, are peculiarly near to Vedantist monism, while others, like that of Ruysbroeck, whom Zaehner quotes at length, are closely geared to biblical and theological beliefs. Ruysbroeck himself warns against the sliding of mystical into pan-cosmic and amoral outlooks.

One of the most valuable contributions of this study is the way in which the author traces secular parallels to some of the religious manifestations. In Western writers experiences are found corresponding to Eastern mystical schools. Thus Rimbaud had a struggle between his Catholic background and his visions of dissolution in the universal mind akin to Vendantist monism; and Proust finds his true self beyond time and space in a way that reminds us of Samkhya-Yoga.

In his magnificent attempt to unravel all this, it may be doubted whether Professor Zaehner has been well served by the use he has made of Jung's categories, though he is definitely critical of Jung on some theological scores. Jung is expounded as teaching that "evil in the psyche is the separation of the rational from the instinctive, the conscious from the unconscious" (p. 114); then criticized for identifying "matter, the body and instinctive life with evil" which is pure Manichaeanism, "the *pessima haeresium*" (p. 123). This may account, as Zaehner says, for "the extreme confusion of Jung's pandaemonium of the collective unconscious". But Zaehner himself comes very near to this *pessima haeresium* when he expounds the sin of Adam as rejecting "God the Father in favour of Nature, his mother from whom his body derived", etc. (p. 201). Nor, I think, is it correct to interpret the Christian's detachment from creatures, "emptying", as a stage corresponding to the self-isolation of non-theistic mysticism, and to say that the essential difference is that the Christian takes the further step towards union with God. It is surely the motive and way of renunciation from the start, and not only the completing of it by something extra, that characterizes the Christian devotee.

But these are secondary points, and may well be misunderstandings. Even if valid they do not deprive this learned and bright comparative study of its force in delineating the cleavage between mutually opposed types of mystical experience. It comes to this. The experience is praeternatural, that is, beyond the reach of normal consciousness; it has many forms, some religious, some profane. On no account may its deliverances, as such, be identified with "the supernatural" or the realm of grace, though, when baptized they can be vehicles of the divine action. And some Christian insights have been reached in no other way.

V. A. Demant.

Christ Church,
Oxford.

THE POWER AND SECRET OF THE JESUITS. By René Fülöp-Miller. Peter Owen. 35s.

This book is an exact reprint of the translation from the German which was published in New York and London by Messrs Putnam in 1930, though without any use of the illustrations so copiously provided in the original editions. The present publishers have also discarded a pretentious bibliography of about a thousand titles, and with good reason, seeing that the author withheld from the march of statement in his narrative any reference to authority and nowhere in his assured stride through a huge and complicated subject gave an indication that he had encountered doubt or difficulty in the weighing of evidence. Yet, as was noted at the time of the appearance of his book, so slight had been his knowledge about the Jesuits in 1925 and 1927, when he produced books about Bolshevism and Rasputin, that he then thought that a parallel might usefully be instituted between the leaders of the Russian Revolution and St Ignatius with his followers, a prejudice which he has been too loath to shed (p. 29). It was apparently the criticism provoked by his use of this comparison which first drew him to some study of the Jesuits, who very soon became the subject for yet another book. By August 1929 he had produced this ambitious survey of the history of the Jesuits through four centuries, which is now reproduced without taking into any account the great progress made in this field of study in a lapse of nearly thirty years, which has been conveniently registered in the review *Archivum Historicum S.J.* since its foundation in 1932.

The best that could ever be said of such a formidable enterprise completed in so short a time, whatever the talent and industry brought to it by its undertaker, is what Dr Johnson had to say of a woman's preaching, "It is not done well; but you are surprised to find it done at all". The historian will expect to find much error and deficiency, since Mr Fülöp-Miller in his preface avows a disdain for the orthodox historical method as a means of gaining insight into Jesuit history. For this purpose he would claim a special virtue for some technique, presumably proper to the journalist, when applied to the partisan controversial writings, and even "the hate-filled pamphlets", about the Jesuits. But the theologian will be less prepared for the lack of understanding of common and traditional doctrine among Christians about the supernatural order and the pursuit of holiness displayed when he boldly enters upon attempts to assess the originality of St Ignatius and to discuss the problem of grace in relation to freewill. There is no mention in these pages of Cladius Aquaviva, though he was probably after Ignatius the greatest of the generals and held the office for the longest period, and little reflection of the outstanding contribution to the achievement of the order yielded by the service of the rank and file. It is easy enough for the plodding historian to miss the most obvious things, but far easier for the runner after copy and high lights.

B. FITZGIBBON, S.J.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

AKADEMIE-VERLAG (BERLIN): Kurt Aland and F. L. Cross (Eds), *Studia Patristica: Papers presented to the Second International Conference on Patristic Studies at Oxford*, 1955, 2 vols (DM. 96.00).

ALLEN AND UNWIN: Henry J. Cadbury, *Quakerism and Early Christianity* (6s. and 4s. 6d.).

BLACKWELL: *The Modern Churchman* (Vol. I, No. 1, New Series) (3s. 6d.); J. Heywood Thomas, *Subjectivity and Paradox* (18s.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: R. L. Colie, *Light and Enlightenment* (20s.); Philip Carrington, *The Early Christian Church* 2 vols (52s. 6d. each).

T. AND T. CLARK: Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, Vol. II, *The Doctrine of God*, Part I (55s.).

EDINBURGH HOUSE PRESS and LUTTERWORTH PRESS: Stephen Neill, *The Unfinished Task* (12s. 6d.).

EDINBURGH UNIVERSITY PRESS: R. Bultmann, *History and Eschatology* (15s.).

FABER AND FABER: *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* (Vol. VIII, No. 1) (18s.); Clare Kirchberger (Ed.), *Richard of St Victor—Selected Writings on Contemplation* (21s.).

FAITH PRESS: N. V. Pierce Butler, *A Book of British Saints* (8s. 6d.); C. B. Moss, *The Church of England and the Seventh Council* (5s.).

FORLAGET LAND OG KIRKE: O. G. Myklebust, *The Study of Missions in Theological Education* (Vol. II) (N.Kr. 29.50).

GOLLANCZ: E. Gilson, *The Christian Philosophy of St Thomas Aquinas* (42s.).

HEINEMANN: William Sargant, *Battle for the Mind* (25s.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: Gordon Powell, *The Secret of Serenity* (7s. 6d.); Bruno S. James, *Saint Bernard of Clairvaux* (12s. 6d.).

INDEPENDENT PRESS: P. T. Forsyth, *God the Holy Father* [a reprint of three books, viz. "The Holy Father and the Living Christ", "Christian Perfection", and "The Taste of Death and Life of Grace"] (9s. 6d.); Erik Routley, *The Organist's Guide to Congregational Praise* (12s. 6d.).

INTER-VARSITY FELLOWSHIP: J. D. C. Anderson (Ed.): *The Quiet Time* (1s.)

IONA COMMUNITY: T. Ralph Morton, *What is the Iona Community?* (2s. 6d.); George F. Macleod, *Bombs and Bishops* (1s.).

LONGMANS: C. C. Martindale, S.J., *The Gospel according to Saint Luke* [Stonyhurst Scripture Manuals for use in Schools] (8s.); E. L. Mascall, *Words and Images* (12s. 6d.).

MACMILLAN (NEW YORK AND LONDON): Edward John Carnell, *Christian Commitment* (35s.).

FREDERICK MULLER: A. P. Davies, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (15s.).

PATERNOSTER PRESS: F. F. Bruce, *Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (10s. 6d.).

ST ANTHONY'S PRESS: A. G. Dickens, *The Marian Reaction in the Diocese of York*, Part II, *The Laity* (3s. 6d.).

S.C.M. PRESS: Erik Routley, *The Wisdom of the Fathers* (8s. 6d.).

MARTIN SECKER AND WARBURG: Edward F. Griffith, *Marriage and the Unconscious* (21s.).

S.P.C.K.: *A Directory of the Religious Life* [Issued by the Advisory Council of Religious Communities] (8s. 6d.); Humphrey Whistler, C.R., *False Alternatives at the Reformatoin* (1s. 6d.); L. W. Grensted, *Jesus and our Need* (3s. 6d.); P. Carrington, *The Story of the Christ* (4s. 6d.); Mary McCulloch, *This Vast Activity* (2s. 6d.); E. G. Parrinder, *An Introduction of Asian Religions* (4s. 6d.); P. S. Robinson, *A Layman's Guide to the Old Testament* (4s. 6d.); W. Montgomery Watt, *The Reality of God* (4s. 6d.); M. H. Shepherd, Jr, *The Liturgy and the Christian Faith* (2s. 6d.); W. K. Lowther Clarke, *Chichester Cathedral: Its History and Art* (3s. 6d.).

THAMES AND HUDSON: Heinrich Boehmer, *Martin Luther: Road to Reformation* (12s. 6d.); E. O. James, *Prehistoric Religion* (30s.).

TYNDALE PRESS: Branse Burbridge, *The Majesty of Self* (1s. 6d.); N. B. Stonehouse, *Paul before the Areopagus* (15s.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON

AN IMPORTANT NEW REFERENCE BOOK

The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church

Edited by

F. L. CROSS

(*Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford and Canon of Christ Church*)

This comprehensive one-volume work will take its place among the Oxford reference books beside the *Companions—to English Literature, to Music,* &c. —and the *Oxford Classical Dictionary,* but it also has several distinctive features.

Its aim is to provide factual information on every aspect of Christianity, especially in its historical development. It contains an alphabetical sequence of well over 6,000 entries or articles ranging from a few lines to about 2,500 words in length, and, appended to the relevant articles, nearly 4,500 concise but important bibliographies.

Biography (Fathers, Saints, Popes, reformers, writers, &c.) naturally accounts for many entries, but others include Christian bodies (local churches, denominations, orders, &c.) doctrine, liturgy, canon law, institutions and customs, asceticism and devotion, places with special Christian associations, councils, documents, and important individual writings (e.g. *Apologia Pro Vita Sua, Pilgrim's Progress*).

Biblical subjects are covered briefly (owing to the existence of other reference books in that field); all post-Biblical periods, and all Christian traditions, Eastern and Western, Catholic and Protestant, European and extra-European, are included, with, however, most stress on what the modern Western reader is most likely to require.

The comprehensiveness, balance, and authority of this volume, together with the bibliographical information included, make it of unique value not only to the scholar but to the educated reader generally both in English-speaking countries and throughout the world.

A detailed prospectus is available

Royal 8vo, 1,512 pages Price in U.K. 70*s.* net

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

MOWBRAY'S LIST

THE PASSION IN AFRICA. With an Introduction by John Taylor and twenty-four full page photographs by Hans Leuenberger. 25*s.*

An African interpretation of the Passion, with a long introduction describing the background and some magnificent photographs, together with Spirituals and quotations from the Gospels.

"We commend this unique book to the notice of the whole Church without reserve."—*Church Times.*

ARCHBISHOP GARBETT. A Memoir by The Prioress of Whitby. 10*s.* 6*d.*

"A really admirable memoir of one of the greatest English Churchmen of the century. . . . It is an intimate biography of a man whom it was never easy to know intimately. It abounds in revealing anecdotes. A most just and excellent piece of work."—*Church Times.*

THE BISHOPS COME TO LAMBETH. By Dewi Morgan, Editorial Secretary of the S.P.G. 5*s.*, cloth 7*s.* 6*d.*

The author prepares for the coming Lambeth Conference of 1958 by a cogent historical sketch of the gradual spread of the English Church overseas, and of its growth into a world-wide community with a particular responsibility in our day. The draft agenda for the Conference is given in an Appendix.

HEADINGS FOR THE LESSONS. SECOND YEAR. By Henry de Candole, Bishop of Knaresborough. 3*s.* 6*d.*

These are "Headings" for the second year (1957-1958) of the new Lectionary authorized by the Convocations. They are for Sundays and the greater Festivals throughout the year, and are intended as a help to the congregation to understand better what the Lesson is about *for them.*

MESSAGE FOR A MISSION. By O. H. Gibbs-Smith, Archdeacon of London. 2*s.* 6*d.*

The Archdeacon urges the need to confront the present situation with an ideology based on the doctrine of the Kingdom of God, and calls for a National Mission as the inevitable means.

THE PARISH MAGAZINE. By J. Blair-Fish. 5*s.*

This useful handbook is full of information and advice about the production of parish magazines, and will be of much benefit to parish priests.

TIME FOR A RHYME. Humorous poems by S. John Forrest. *Illustrated.* 6*s.*

A successor to *What's the Use?* of which John Betjeman wrote: "Has long delighted me . . . when we have faith we can also afford to laugh."

A. R. MOWBRAY & CO. LTD, 28 Margaret St, London, W.1

35 Pembroke Street, Oxford. - 14 King's Parade, Cambridge

And at Leeds, Birmingham, and Manchester